



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

<sup>A</sup>  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,422	02/22/2002	Masahiro Ichihara	R2184.0135/P135	7009

24998 7590 07/27/2005

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP  
2101 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/079,422

Applicant(s)

ICHIHARA, MASAHIRO

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Claim Status*

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1-8 are rejected as detailed below.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Pat No 6,769,096 issued to Kuppusamy et al (hereafter Kuppusamy).

Claims 1 and 6:

Kuppusamy discloses:

a document association object [Fig 3, 215, col 6, line 60 – col 7, line 5] linking a reference-source document [TOC document 220, Fig 4] to a referenced-material document [target document 202, Fig 4] in the database

a management unit generating property data of the document association object, the property data including a first identifier<sup>1</sup>[executive summary 260, Fig 4, col 8, lines 41-50] indicating a section of the reference-source document and a second identifier [bookmark, col 8,

---

<sup>1</sup> Examiner interprets identifier per Webster's New World College Dictionary , Fourth Edition as distinguish or characterize

Art Unit: 2161

line 65 – col 9, line 5, executive summary 264, Fig 4] indicating a section of the referenced-material document, wherein the property data of the document association object is provided to recognize a particular relation [quarterly report, Fig 4, col 7, lines 38-50] that links the reference-source document section to the referenced-material document section

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuppusamy in view of US Pat No 6,549,916 issued to Sedlar (hereafter Sedlar).

#### Claim 2:

Kuppusamy discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above and furthermore also discloses wherein the management unit is configured to generate the property data of the document association object, the property data including the first identifier [TOC document 220, Fig 4], the second identifier [target document 202, Fig 4]. However, Kuppusamy does not disclose a third identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and a fourth identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document. Sedlar discloses an identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and an identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document [col 35, lines 17-25]. It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2161

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kuppusamy to include a third identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and a fourth identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document which includes the teachings of Sedlar for the purpose of maintaining a record of the revisions to the source file and to the target file. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Kuppusamy per the above such that it can be decided whether the link should be traversed or whether a new search should be performed [col 35, lines 3-8].

Furthermore, Sedlar discloses wherein the property data of the document association object is provided to recognize a particular relation that links the reference-source document version and section to the referenced-material document version and section [col 35, lines 1-8]

Claim 3:

Kuppusamy discloses:

providing a document association object linking a reference-source document [TOC document 220, Fig 4] to a referenced-material document [target document 202, Fig 4] in the database

generating property data of the document association object, the property data including a first identifier [executive summary 260, Fig 4, col 8, lines 41-50] indicating a section of the reference-source document, a second identifier [bookmark, col 8, line 65 – col 9, line 5, executive summary 264, Fig 4] indicating a section of the referenced-material document

Kuppusamy discloses the essential elements of the invention as noted above but does not disclose a third identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and a fourth

Art Unit: 2161

identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document. Sedlar discloses an identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and an identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document [col 35, lines 17-25]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kuppusamy to include a third identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and a fourth identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document which includes the teachings of Sedlar for the purpose of maintaining a record of the revisions to the source file and to the target file. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Kuppusamy per the above such that it can be decided whether the link should be traversed or whether a new search should be performed [col 35, lines 3-8].

Furthermore, Sedlar discloses wherein the property data of the document association object is provided to recognize a particular relation that links the reference-source document version and section to the referenced-material document version and section [col 35, lines 1-8]

Claim 4:

The combination of Kuppusamy and Sedlar discloses the elements of claim 3 as noted above and furthermore Sedlar discloses detecting that a relevant document linked to the document association object is renewed to change a previous version of the relevant document to a new version; and updating the property data of the document association object so that one of the reference-source document version and the referenced-material document version is renewed so as to match the new version of the relevant document [col 30, lines 30-58].

Claim 7:

Art Unit: 2161

Kuppusamy discloses the elements of claim 6 as noted above and furthermore also discloses wherein the management unit is configured to generate the property data of the document association object, the property data including the first identifier [TOC document 220, Fig 4], the second identifier [target document 202, Fig 4]. However, Kuppusamy does not disclose a third identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and a fourth identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document. Sedlar discloses an identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and an identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document [col 35, lines 17-25]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kuppusamy to include a third identifier indicating a version of the reference-source document and a fourth identifier indicating a version of the referenced-material document which includes the teachings of Sedlar for the purpose of maintaining a record of the revisions to the source file and to the target file. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Kuppusamy per the above such that it can be decided whether the link should be traversed or whether a new search should be performed [col 35, lines 3-8].

Furthermore, Sedlar discloses wherein the property data of the document association object is provided to recognize a particular relation that links the reference-source document version and section to the referenced-material document version and section [col 35, lines 1-8]

Claim 8:

The combination of Kuppusamy and Sedlar discloses the elements of claims 6 and 7 as noted above and furthermore, Kuppusamy discloses when a relevant document, linked to the document association object, is renewed to change a previous version of the relevant document

Art Unit: 2161

to a new version, the property data of the document association object so that one of the reference-source document version and the referenced-material document version is renewed so as to match the new version of the relevant document [col 2, lines 30-40, col 7, lines 15-50].

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kuppusamy and Sedlar and further in view of Pub No US 2003/0046315 (hereafter Feig)

Claim 5:

The combination of Kuppusamy and Sedlar discloses the elements of claim 3 as noted above but does not disclose detecting that a section of a relevant document linked to the document association object is deleted and deleting the document association object including the property data. Feig discloses detecting that a section of a relevant document linked to the document association object is deleted and deleting the document association object including the property data [paragraph 72]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include detecting that a section of a relevant document linked to the document association object is deleted and deleting the document association object including the property data as taught by Feig for the purpose of removing an association of a source document with a target document. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the above combination of references such that a user is able to delete obsolete references between documents.

***Response to Arguments***



Applicant's arguments filed 6/24/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Applicant Argues:**

Applicant states in the third paragraph of page 5, "Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Kuppusamy. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites 'a document association object linking a reference source document to a referenced material document in the database; and a management unit generating property data of the document association object.' Kuppusamy discloses a system where a TOC document 22 is created from a target document 202, and where entries in the TOC document 220 are links to corresponding anchors in the target document 202. There is no document association object in the Kuppusamy system. Kuppusamy provides linking elements in the two documents themselves, but there is no document association object. element 215, mentioned in the Office Action, is just a screen display, it is not a document."

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. MPEP § 2106 requires Office personnel to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (fed. Cir. 1997). Claims must be interpreted in view of the specification without importing limitations from the specification into the claims. Applicant in above argument fails to point to instant specification such that the claimed "object" can be accurately interpreted. A common dictionary<sup>2</sup> definition of "object" will be the best

---

<sup>2</sup> Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition

Art Unit: 2161

approach in this situation where applicant does not provide a clear and concise description. The definition of “object” most relevant to applicant’s field of endeavor is the following:

A single, runtime instance of object type that the operating system defines. Objects visible in user mode include event, file, I/O completion port, key, object directory, port, process, section, semaphore, symbolic link, thread, timer, and token objects.

Examiner maintains at least the linking elements as referenced in above Office Action as being disclosed by Kuppusamy is in line with above dictionary definition of object.

Notwithstanding the above matching of the disclosure of Kuppusamy to the claimed object, examiner consulted instant specification and found that date of creation can be used as an “object.” Kuppusamy in column 7, line 26 discloses a date field for linking documents.

Examiner maintains Kuppusamy’s disclosure of a date field for linking documents is a separate and independent instance where Kuppusamy’s disclosure reads on the claimed invention.

### *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2161

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00am and 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Etienne LeRoux

7/21/2005



**MOHAMMAD ALI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**